

**REMARKS**

This paper is filed in response to the Office Action mailed January 28, 2008.  
Claims 69 to 87 are pending and under consideration.

Regarding the Amendments

The amendment to the claims is supported throughout the specification. In particular, the amendment to recite a “vinylpyrrolidone-vinyl acetate copolymer” polymeric processing aid is supported, for example, by originally filed claims 17, 22 and 23. Accordingly, as the amendment to the claims is supported by the specification no new matter has been added and entry thereof is respectfully requested.

I. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§102(b) and 103(a)

The rejection of claims 69 to 71, 73 to 78, 80 and 81 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Cummings (U.S. Patent No. 5,369,100) is respectfully traversed. The grounds for rejection are set forth at page 2 of the Office Action.

Claims 69 to 71, 73 to 78, 80 and 81, as amended, are not anticipated by Cummings. In particular, for example, Cummings fail to teach or suggest an insecticidal pellet with acephate and a vinylpyrrolidone-vinyl acetate copolymer polymeric processing aid. Consequently, as Cummings fail to teach or suggest each an every element of claims 69 to 71, 73 to 78, 80 and 81, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Cummings (U.S. Patent No. 5,369,100) must be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 69, 72 to 76 and 79 to 82 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by Chan *et al.* (WO 91/11104) is respectfully traversed. The grounds for rejection are set forth at page 2 of the Office Action.

Claims 69, 72 to 76 and 79 to 82, as amended, are not anticipated by Chan *et al.* In particular, for example, Chan *et al.* fail to teach or suggest an insecticidal pellet with acephate and a vinylpyrrolidone-vinyl acetate copolymer polymeric processing aid. Consequently, as Chan *et al.* fail to teach or suggest each an every element of claims 69, 72 to 76 and 79 to 82, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Chan *et al.* (WO 91/11104) must be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 69, 74 to 76 and 81 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by, or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly obvious over

Misselbrook *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,160,530) is respectfully traversed. The grounds for rejection are set forth at page 3 of the Office Action.

Claims 69, 74 to 76 and 81, as amended, are not anticipated by Misselbrook *et al.* In particular, for example, Misselbrook *et al.* fail to teach or suggest an insecticidal pellet with acephate and a vinylpyrrolidone-vinyl acetate copolymer polymeric processing aid. Consequently, as Misselbrook *et al.* fail to teach or suggest each an every element of claims 69, 74 to 76 and 81 the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a) over Misselbrook *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,160,530) must be withdrawn.

---

The rejection of claims 69 to 71, 73 to 78, 80 and 81 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by, or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly obvious over Chan *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,464,623) is respectfully traversed. The grounds for rejection are set forth at page 3 of the Office Action.

Claims 69 to 71, 73 to 78, 80 and 81, as amended, are not anticipated by Chan *et al.* In particular, for example, Chan *et al.* fail to teach or suggest an insecticidal pellet with acephate and a vinylpyrrolidone-vinyl acetate copolymer polymeric processing aid. Consequently, as Chan *et al.* fail to teach or suggest each an every element of claims 69 to 71, 73 to 78, 80 and 81 the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a) over Chan *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,464,623) must be withdrawn.

The rejection of claims 69 to 82 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly anticipated by, or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly obvious over Yamada *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,488,043) is respectfully traversed. The grounds for rejection are set forth at page 3 of the Office Action.

Claims 69 to 82, as amended, are not anticipated by Yamada *et al.* In particular, for example, Yamada *et al.* fail to teach or suggest an insecticidal pellet with acephate and a vinylpyrrolidone-vinyl acetate copolymer polymeric processing aid. Consequently, as Yamada *et al.* fail to teach or suggest each an every element of claims 69 to 82 the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a) over Yamada *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 5,488,043) must be withdrawn.

**CONCLUSION**


In summary, for the reasons set forth herein, Applicants maintain that claims clearly and patentably define the invention, respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the various grounds set forth in the Office Action, and respectfully request the allowance of the claims which are now pending.

If the Examiner would like to discuss any of the issues raised in the Office Action, Applicant's representative can be reached at (858) 509-4065.

Please charge any fees associated with the submission of this paper to Deposit Account Number 033975. The Commissioner for Patents is also authorized to credit any over payments to the above-referenced Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP

  
ROBERT M. BEDGOOD

Reg. No. 43488

Tel. No. 858.509.4065

Fax No. 858 509.4010

Date: July 18, 2008  
12255 El Camino Real  
Suite 300  
San Diego, CA 92130-4088  
(619) 234-5000

**CERTIFICATION UNDER 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.8 and/or 1.10\***

(When using Express Mail, the Express Mail label number is *mandatory*; Express Mail certification is *optional*.)

I hereby certify that, on the date shown below, this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature

PATRICIA MUNOZ

(type or print name of person certifying)

\* Only the date of filing (§ 1.6) will be the date used in a patent term adjustment calculation, although the date on any certificate of mailing or transmission under § 1.8 continues to be taken into account in determining timeliness. See § 1.703(f). Consider "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" (§ 1.10) or facsimile transmission (§ 1.6(d)) for the reply to be accorded the earliest possible filing date for patent term adjustment calculations.